SECTION 1

STUDY BASIS

(1) PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

During 1981, a comprehensive investigation of existing development, development commitments and additional development capability in the Study Area was conducted to provide a preliminary assessment of boundary suitability.

The Background Report on the preliminary work assumed that the Georgetown sewage treatment plant would be improved and expanded to a capacity of approximately 5 million gallons per day. The sewage treatment capacity was then allocated to existing development within the Study Area as well as the 3 hamlets of Norval, Stewarttown and Glen Williams. Capacity was then set aside for committed development projects within the Study Area and finally capacity was allocated to the remaining undeveloped lands which were within former Town boundaries and north of Silver Creek.

The calculations were summarized in Table 10 of the Background Report. That table is reproduced as Table 1 on the following page of this Report. Table 1 shows that an expanded sewage treatment plant could accommodate about 11,300 additional people outside the presently-developed Georgetown urban area.

(2) SERVICING REVIEW

The servicing review was carried out by Gore & Storrie Limited. The review considered water supply, sewage collection and storm water drainage for the major blocks of unserviced lands within the Study Area. The review included the examination of present data, systems and servicing reports.

(a) WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM:

This Report assumes that the water supply for the proposed urban development in the Study Area will be provided by the water system in the Town of Halton Hills.

A report on the water supply and distribution system for the Town of Halton Hills was made by Simcoe Engineering in 1978. In that report, the existing system was analyzed and improvements were recommended to serve the Town and future developments outside the old Town limits including the neighbouring hamlets of Stewarttown, Glen Williams and Norval.

TABLE 1 EXISTING, COMMITTED AND UNCOMMITTED DEVELOPMENT
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

FLOW SOURCE	SEWAGE TREATMENT ALLOCATION (gal/day)		POPULATION[1]
POTENTIAL:		5,000,000	40,000
Existing and Committed Development		3,182,043	25,456
SURPLUS:		1,817,957	14,544
Developable Residential	45,506		
Developable Commercial	3,204		
Developable Industrial	82,301		
TOTAL DEVELOPABLE:[2]		131,011	1,048
SURPLUS:		1,686,946	13,496
Constrained Residential	205,570		
Constrained Industrial	70,882		
TOTAL CONSTRAINED:[2]		276,452	2,212
SURPLUS:		1,410,494	11,284

[1] NOTE: Based on overall flow contribution rate of 125 gallons/capita/day.

[2] NOTE: Lands within former Town boundary and north of Silver Creek only.

To examine water supply, 3 alternative systems were considered. System 1 would serve only that portion of the Study Area west of the former Town limits, south of Highway 7 and north of Silver Creek. System 2 would serve all lands in the Study Area south of Silver Creek to the southerly limit of the former Town boundary. System 3 would service all undeveloped lands in the Study Area with the exception of those lands lying north of Highway 7 since no provisions were made to service this area.

If system 1 is chosen, a number of improvements will be required to the existing system in the Moore Park area so that it can be extended to serve the areas generally lying north of the railway line which extends southwesterly to Stewarttown. The area south of that railway would require the development of additional wells in Stewarttown and improvements to the Maple Avenue pumping station. Initial estimated costs of system 1 are set out in Table 2.

TABLE 2 — WATER SUPPLY - SYSTEM 1
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

Supply	
2 wells at Stewarttown	$ 345,000
additional storage at Maple Ave. P.S.	188,000
improvements to Maple Ave. P.S.	125,000
replacing Moore Park Booster P.S.	250,000
Feedermains	732,000
TOTAL:	$ 1,640,000

Alternative 2 relies on the development of a new water supply from proposed wells at Huttonville, south of Georgetown. The system would also be connected to the existing Georgetown system north of Silver Creek. The preliminary estimate of costs for this system is set out in Table 3.

TABLE 3 WATER SUPPLY - SYSTEM 2
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

Supply	
2 wells at Stewarttown	$ 305,000
2 wells at Huttonville	563,000
new pumping station at southeast area	375,000
storage at the pumping station	500,000
Feedermains	
from Huttonville Well supply to reservoir and pumping station	782,000
other necessary feedermains	1,725,000
TOTAL:	$ 4,250,000

System 3 combines most of the elements of systems 1 and 2 except that all facilities are at a larger scale to service larger area and population. Preliminary cost estimates are summarized in Table 4.

TABLE 4 WATER SUPPLY - SYSTEM 3
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

Supply	
2 wells at Stewarttown	$ 305,000
2 wells at Huttonville	688,000
new pumping station in the southeast area	438,000
storage in the southeast area	625,000
replacing Moore Park Booster P.S.	250,000
TOTAL:	$ 5,150,000

The above preliminary estimates reflect only the cost of improvements to provide sufficient supply to the proposed development. They do not include the cost of distribution mains within the development areas.

(b) SANITARY SEWERS:

Servicing of the undeveloped lands within the Study Area has been investigated on the basis of analyzing which areas can be serviced by gravity. The analysis shows that all of the undeveloped lands can be serviced by gravity except for the lands north of Highway 7 and east of the creek as well as the lands south of Silver Creek and east of the Tenth Line.

In this analysis, the existing sanitary sewerage system in Georgetown has been analyzed relating the actual capacity of the trunk system and the theoretical peak flows determined based on future population. The findings indicate that the trunk sewers are adequate to carry the flows from some of the undeveloped areas assuming that there is no increase in flows from the areas presently serviced.

The conceptual servicing is done by providing trunk sewers that will discharge to existing trunk sewers or to the existing sewage treatment plant. Possible collection systems are set out in Table 5.

TABLE 5 POSSIBLE SEWAGE COLLECTION SYSTEMS
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

NAME AND AREAS TO BE SERVED	SIZE OF AREA (ACRES)	PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE[1]	COST PER ACRE
North-South Trunk			
west of old boundary, north of Maple Avenue, south of Hwy. 7	155	$ 700,000	$ 4,500+
West-East Trunk			
south of Silver Creek, west of Eighth Line	110	100,000	900+
North-East Trunk			
south of Silver Creek, inside old boundary	485	1,100,000	2,200+
West-East Trunk			
south of Silver Creek, outside old boundary	568	1,500,000	2,600+
Southeast Trunk			
north of Silver Creek, east of old boundary, south of Hwy. 7	12	100,000	8,000+

[1]NOTE: Cost estimates are based on providing trunk sewers only. The cost of local sewers is not included.

(c) STORM WATER DRAINAGE:

It was concluded that there are no constraints to provide drainage systems for all of the undeveloped portions of the Study Area. Because of the proximity of the existing creeks, storm water management can be developed during the design of each development according to Town standards.

SECTION 2 FUTURE LAND REQUIREMENTS

(1) RESIDENTIAL LAND

Table 1 shows that an additional 11,284 people could be accommodated outside the presently-developed portion of the Study Area.

In 1979, the Study Area had a population of 17,076 housed in 5,534 dwelling units. On the basis of those figures, the overall household size in Georgetown was 3.25 persons per unit. Although household sizes are decreasing across the Province, this Report assumes that household size will remain constant and, therefore, 3,472 new dwelling units will be required to house the potential population of the Study Area.

The housing mix for Georgetown in 1979 is shown in Table 6. Table 6 also shows the breakdown of proposed housing units assuming that the housing mix remains constant.

TABLE 6 HOUSING MIX
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

DENSITY	UNITS (1979)	PERCENT	POTENTIAL UNITS
Low	4,555	82.3%	2,858
Medium	377	6.8	236
High	602	10.9	378
TOTALS:	5,534	100.0%	3,472

The requirement for residential land is calculated in Table 7. The units per acre figures used are derived from existing densities in the developed portion of Georgetown.[1]

---

[1] NOTE: Of the 1,691 acres of land designated for low density residential development in the Georgetown Official Plan, 1,283 acres are located in the urban portion of the Study Area. In 1979, there were 4,555 one and two-family dwelling units in that area for an overall gross density of 3.5 units per acre.

TABLE 7 RESIDENTIAL LAND REQUIRED
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

DENSITY	UNITS PER ACRE[1]	PROPOSED UNITS	UNITS REQUIRED (ACRES)
Low	3.5	2,858	817
Medium	12	236	20
High	30	378	13
TOTALS:		3,472	850

Table 7 shows a requirement of 850 acres of residential land to accommodate the additional potential population in the Study Area.

(2) INSTITUTIONAL LAND

(a) PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:

In the urban portion of the Study Area, there were 5,263 dwelling units in 1979. In that same year, Georgetown public elementary schools had a total enrollment of 2,485 pupils, for an average of 0.47 pupils per dwelling unit. If this ratio remains constant, the potential 3,472 dwelling units would generate an additional 1,632 pupils. The Halton Board of Education uses a pupil loading factor of 35 pupils per classroom for public elementary schools. This would mean a demand for an additional 47 elementary school classrooms. However, enrollments are projected by the Board to decline even further over the next several years so that many of the additional pupils would likely be accommodated at existing public elementary schools in or adjacent to the Study Area.

No additional land is being provided for public elementary school sites as any sites which may be required can be provided within the land set aside for residential development.

[1]NOTE: These figures include residential lots, elementary school sites, neighborhood parks, local commercial activities and roads.

(b) SEPARATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:

Separate elementary schools in the Study Area have also experienced enrollment declines. If one or more future school sites are required to serve the new population, however, they can be accommodated in the proposed residential areas.

(c) PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS:

The only public secondary school serving the Study Area is the Georgetown District High School. Its enrollment has been continually declined from a high of nearly 2,000 in 1976 to just under 1,850 in 1980. Enrollment is projected to further decline to under 1,500 by 1985.

In 1979, the ratio of secondary school pupils to dwelling units in the overall Study Area was 0.35. If this ratio is applied to the 3,472 potential dwelling units, some 1,215 new secondary school pupils may be added to the Study Area. At the Board of Education's prescribed ratio of 30 pupils per classroom, 41 new classrooms would be required. Assuming that declining enrollment at the existing Georgetown High School permits that school to accommodate as much as 25% of these potential new secondary school pupils, another secondary school site of about 15 acres would be required.

(d) OTHER INSTITUTIONAL USES:

The Georgetown Official Plan designated a possible site for a hospital or other major institutional facility in the area south of Silver Creek. It is now expected that land requirements for other institutional activities will be accommodated within the already-developed portion of the Study Area and so no land will be required for these uses.

(3) COMMERCIAL LAND

(a) COMMUNITY/REGIONAL COMMERCIAL:

The Halton Hills Downtown Study places strong emphasis on strengthening the existing downtown area. One of its policy recommendations, which has been endorsed by Town

Council, is the need to restrict new community or regional level commercial facilities to the existing downtown area. Therefore, no land is provided for such commercial facilities in the undeveloped portions of the Study Area.

(b) NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL:

Provision for neighborhood commercial facilities has been included in the residential land requirements so that a separate requirement for this use will not be necessary.

(4) INDUSTRIAL LANDS

Table 1 of this Report shows a surplus sewage treatment capacity of 1,410,494 gallons per day. Of this surplus, residential development will use 688,324 gallons per day, leaving 722,170 gallons per day for industrial use. Dividing this surplus by the flow contribution rate for industrial development yields an industrial land requirement of just under 300 acres.

(5) PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

(a) NEIGHBORHOOD OPEN SPACE:

The area allocated for new residential development includes land requirements for neighborhood parks and playgrounds.

(b) COMMUNITY PARKLAND:

According to the Town's 1979 Recreation Master Plan, there are 55 acres of usable community parkland. With a current population of just under 18,000, the Study Area has just over 3 acres per 1,000 population. Due to an observed lack of facilities, a standard of 5 acres per 1,000 will be used. This results in a current defficiency of about 35 acres and an overall requirement of 145 additional acres to serve a population of 40,000. It is recommended that most of these lands be acquired in the Credit River and Silver Creek valleys which contain about 250 acres and 400 acres respectively.

(6) OVERALL REQUIREMENTS

In most growing urban areas, there is a frequent tendency for new development to scatter or spill over into adjacent rural areas. In the absence of adequate land use controls, some of this sprawl may be attributed to cheaper land and/or lower taxes; but other factors also play a significant role. In some cases, particularly with industrial development, the land either is not available within the urban area or is not suitable for the needs of the prospective user. In other cases, the owner of agricultural land, or the owner of a residential use with potential for redevelopment to commercial or industrial uses, does not wish to sell or develop his land for such other uses. In some instances, the land may not be readily marketable. These are only some of the reasons which account for various parcels of land remaining vacant while new development spreads beyond them to satisfy a community's basic growth requirements. In order to avoid land shortages caused by such factors, it is advisable to add a 'vacancy allowance' to the projected future land requirements.

This Report therefore proposes that a vacancy allowance equal to 10% of the residential land requirement and 25% of the industrial land requirement should be provided in addition to basic acreage requirements so that the Town can adequately plan for its long-term growth. Total requirements, including the vacancy allowances, are shown in Table 8 for each major land use category.

TABLE 8

OVERALL LAND REQUIREMENTS
GEORGETOWN URBAN AREA
TOWN OF HALTON HILLS

LAND USE	BASIC REQUIREMENT	VACANCY ALLOWANCE	TOTAL REQUIREMENT
Residential	850 acres	85 acres	935 acres
Institutional	15		15
Commercial	nil		nil
Industrial	300	75	375
Open Space	145		145
TOTALS:	1,310 acres	160 acres	1,470 acres

SECTION 3 BOUNDARY ASSESSMENT

In assessing the present boundary and determining a proposed urban boundary for Georgetown, consideration has been given several factors including potential population, urban land requirements, development constraints, servicing and hamlets.

Table 8 shows a need for 1,380 acres of land to accommodate the ultimate development which could be supported by an expanded sewage treatment plant. However, the undeveloped portion of the Study Area is somewhat larger. It is then apparent that an urban area boundary for Georgetown need not take in the entire Study Area.

The recommended urban boundary for Georgetown is shown on the map following this page. On the map, each portion of the Study Area which has been left outside the proposed urban boundary has been assigned a number. The reasons for excluding each of the numbered areas are described below:

(1) AREA 1

This area has been excluded from the urban boundary because it is part of the new Glen Williams Secondary Planning Area and therefore planned for hamlet rather than major urban development.

(2) AREA 2

The easterly half of Area 2 contains a major private institutional development. This development will be largely self-contained in that housing and hard services will be provided on site solely for this development. This leaves only the west half of Area 2 for potential development. However, a number of factors make these lands less attractive for urban development purposes. The lands are relatively isolated from the existing Georgetown urban area. Highway 7 serves as a significant barrier, particularly in respect to access to schools for young pupils. The lands are also the farthest removed from the trunk services which would be necessary to support urban development. To make it economically feasible to service these lands, a substantial part of the area from Maple Avenue north to Highway 7 would have to be developed first.

(3) AREA 3

Area 3 is not included in the proposed urban boundary because it is part of the new Secondary Planning Area for Stewarttown.

STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
FORMER TOWN BOUNDARY

3 AREAS OUTSIDE PROPOSED URBAN BOUNDARY

SCALE IN METRES

350 0 350 700 1050

PROPOSED URBAN BOUNDARY
Georgetown Urban Area
Town of Halton Hills

Marshall Planning Consultants

TOWN PLANNERS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

(4) AREA 4

Of all lands in the Study Area south of Silver Creek, Area 4 has physical features which make it impractical to service with gravity sewers. The elimination of Area 4 from the urban boundary will also provide a buffer between the proposed urban area to the west and the hamlet of Norval to the east.

SECTION 4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Once the Georgetown urban boundary has been confirmed, a number of further actions will be required to insure the proper ultimate development of the urban area. It is recommended that the following be included among those actions.

(1) CONFIRM SEWAGE TREATMENT CAPACITY

When the Stage I Report has been endorsed by the Regional and Town Councils, an Approval Certificate should be sought from the Ministry of the Environment.

(2) ESTIMATE TIMING OF DEVELOPMENT

A study should be made to determine the estimated time frame required to achieve the ultimate population growth which can be served by the treatment plant.

(3) AMEND REGIONAL PLAN

An amendment to the Regional Official Plan should be prepared to define the new Georgetown Urban Area boundary. The amendment should be circulated in draft form to the various commenting agencies so that any potential problems can be identified and ideally resolved before formal adoption takes place.

(4) CONDUCT WATER SUPPLY STUDY

During the course of this Study, several sources of water to supply the potential development have been proposed. It will be necessary to further investigate these possible sources as well as the necessary additions to the existing supply system.

(5) UNDERTAKE COMMUNITY DESIGN

The potential development pattern of the new urban area should be designed. This would involve identifying preferred locations for the various major land use categories including residential, institutional, commercial, industrial and open space. This work has been included as part of the Town's Official Plan project.

(6) CONDUCT TRAFFIC STUDY

In conjunction with the land use planning study, a traffic study of the new urban area should be conducted to identify any improvements which will be required to the existing road system and to assist in determining a suitable road pattern for the undeveloped areas.

(7) DEVELOP STAGING PLAN

The planning of the Georgetown Urban Area should include the development of a staging plan designed to enhance realization of objectives in the Regional Official Plan which deal with a logical sequence of development and the provision of compact urban communities.

APPENDIX

REPORT ON RESPONSES
TO THE
HALTON HILLS (GEORGETOWN)
URBAN AREA REVIEW STUDY

PM 582½/2
31 May 1982

MUNICIPAL PLANNING CONSULTANTS
DIVISION OF MPC LIMITED
TOWN PLANNERS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS

BACKGROUND

On March 18, 1982, a Public Meeting on The Georgetown Urban Area Review Study was held at Centennial Public School in Georgetown. At that meeting the Steering Group invited submissions from all interested parties. Some 6 responses were received.

The responses were forwarded to the Consultants for review and recommendations. On the following pages, each response has been summarized and the Consultants' recommendations have been set out together with the decisions of the Steering Group.

RESPONDENT: Mrs. L. Emslie
R.R. #1
GEORGETOWN, Ontario

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE:

1. Raw sewage is in Silver Creek and drainage from the hospital area is reaching a tributary of Silver Creek.
2. Respondent questions the costs and benefits of the proposed growth for existing ratepayers.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Check the validity of these concerns and take any necessary remedial actions.
2. Advise respondent of the expected costs and benefits of the proposed development.
3. No change to the Urban Area boundaries should be made.

DECISIONS:

1. Regional Works Department will investigate possible sewage disposal problems.
2. Chairman will write to respondent.
3. The Urban Area boundaries will not be changed.

RESPONDENT: International Bible Students Association of Canada
P.O. Box 4100
GEORGETOWN, Ontario
L7G 4Y4

REQUEST: The respondent wishes to connect to the sanitary sewerage system.

RECOMMENDATION: The proposed Regional Official Plan Amendment No. 2 may permit sewer connections for existing development outside Urban Area boundaries. It should be determined if this property would be eligible for connection to the sanitary sewer under this proposed policy. In any case, a boundary change to include this property is not recommended.

DECISION: The Urban Area boundary will not be changed.

RESPONDENT: F.J. Reinders and Associates Limited
on behalf of Mr. G.E. Garrett

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE:

The respondent requests that his client's property be included in the Urban Area boundaries because:

- it has poor soil classification for agriculture;
- it squares off north boundary of Urban Area;
- it avoids pressures for commercial development;
- it creates low density buffer between urban and rural lands;
- it provides attractive entrance to Urban Area;
- new development will be at lower than historic densities; and
- lands in present Urban Area will not develop.

The report also discusses access, storm drainage, water distribution and sewage collection.

DISCUSSION:

Most of the reasons given for including this property are difficult to substantiate. The difficulties are:

- although soil classification is poor, the site exhibits characteristics of a viable, on-going agricultural operation;
- squaring off the north boundary assumes the inclusion of the IBSA lands which are not recommended for inclusion;
- it may still be difficult to resist commercial pressures if the proposed buffer strip is retained in private ownership;
- low density buffer question is double-edged as rural residential development should be in the rural area and not on the urban fringe;

DISCUSSION (cont'd.)

- proposal should provide attractive entrance to Town;
- there should be no difficulty achieving the projected densities even with a park requirement of 5 acres per 1,000 persons; and
- sewage treatment capacity should be reserved for undeveloped sites within the present Urban Area unless the Town is prepared to prohibit development of such sites in the new Halton Hills Official Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: The Urban Area boundaries should not be changed to include this property.

DECISION: No boundary change will be made.

RESPONDENT: Georgetown Area Ratepayers Association
P.O. Box 55
GEORGETOWN, Ontario

SUMAMRY OF RESPONSE: The respondent wants full consideration of the concerns raised in GARA's 1978 response to the Focal Property proposal. Many details of the Urban Area Review Study approach (both Stages I and II) are questionned. There is also discussion of some financial issues. The submission concludes that no additional growth should occur before servicing and financial issues are examined in more depth.

DISCUSSION: Most of the questions and issues raised in the submission are addressed either in the Urban Area Review Study or by existing Regional and Town policies. Many of these same items were also discussed at the March 18 public meeting in Georgetown.

RECOMMENDATION: As many of the concerns noted in the submission seem to result from a lack of information, it may be useful for the Steering Group to write to the GARA executive to cover these points again. No changes to the Urban Area boundaries should be made.

DECISION: The Steering Group will write to GARA. No boundary changes will be made.

RESPONDENT: North Halton Golf and Country Club
R.R. #2
GEORGETOWN, Ontario

REQUEST: The submission requests a change in the proposed Urban Area boundaries to include the club buildings so that a possible future connection to the sanitary sewerage system may be made.

RECOMMENDATION: It should be determined whether this property would be eligible to connect to a future sanitary sewer if it is outside the Urban Area boundary. If the answer is no and if there is a bona-fide commitment from the Town to allow a future connection, then the Urban Area boundary may require adjustment.

DECISION: Sewage treatment capacity has already been set aside for the Stewarttown Secondary Planning Area. As part of the Stewarttown Secondary Planning Area, this club can benefit from any future extension of services to Stewarttown. No boundary change is required.

RESPONDENT: Mr. J.R. Willms of Vaughan, Willms
on behalf of Gainsborough Farm Holdings

RESPONSE: The submission does not request any changes or additions to the Urban Area boundaries but does ask for information on Study status.

RECOMMENDATION: Advise respondent of Study status.

DECISION: Regional Planning Director advise respondent of Study status.

STUDY AREA BOUNDARY

FORMER TOWN BOUNDARY

3 AREAS OUTSIDE PROPOSED URBAN BOUNDARY

RESPONDENTS TO PROPOSED URBAN BOUNDARY
Georgetown Urban Area
Town of Halton Hills

Marshall Planning Consultants

SCALE IN METRES